



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

constituting it, avail themselves of its benefits. Disarmament of the nations should follow such recognition of any provision for the reign of reason over the passions of mankind. The facts that during the past year the Interparliamentary Peace Union, containing Parliamentary representatives from fourteen European Powers, has formulated a plan for an international tribunal; that France has officially proposed to this country a permanent treaty of arbitration, and that it is semi-officially reported that negotiations are pending between the United States and Great Britain for a similar treaty, justify the belief that the way is now open to create between this country and Great Britain, and between this country and France, and perhaps with other Powers also, some permanent system of judicial arbitration as the essential safeguard of civilization.

"We assure President Cleveland that a great majority of his countrymen will hail the consummation of such a treaty as the auspicious harbinger of welfare to the world, assuring peace among leading nations, security and expansion to industry and commerce, steadier employment at more remunerative wages to workingmen, more exalted civilization, a condition of the world in accord with the enlightened conscience of man and the loving will of God. We earnestly call upon statesmen, ministers of every faith, the newspaper and periodical press, colleges and schools, chambers of commerce and boards of trade, organizations of workingmen, and upon all good men and women to exert their influence in favor of this movement, both in making known to the President their desire for a permanent tribunal and in helping to create a larger public sentiment against war, which shall be an efficient and constant support of the new judicial system thus to be founded."

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

The platform adopted by the Republicans in their recent convention at St. Louis, excellent as it is in many respects, does not concern directly the purposes for which this paper is published, except so far as it relates to the foreign policy of the United States and the method of settling disputes internal or external. Those sections of the platform concerning our foreign relations seem to us, on the whole, both by what they say and by what they omit to say, to cater to the jingoistic elements of our population in a manner unworthy of our time, unworthy of a great party, and certain to be displeasing to many of the best and most intelligent men in the Republican ranks.

Here are the sections in full:

Our foreign policy should be at all times firm, vigorous and dignified, and all our interests in the western hemisphere carefully watched and guarded. The Hawaiian Islands should be controlled by the United States, and no foreign power should be permitted to interfere with them;

the Nicaragua canal should be built, owned and operated by the United States; and by the purchase of the Danish Islands we should secure a proper and much needed naval station in the West Indies.

The massacres in Armenia have aroused the deep sympathy and just indignation of the American people and we believe that the United States should exercise all the influence it can properly exert to bring these atrocities to an end.

In Turkey American residents have been exposed to the gravest dangers and American property destroyed there, and everywhere American citizens and American property must be absolutely protected at all hazards and at any cost.

We reassert the Monroe doctrine in its full extent, and we reaffirm the right of the United States to give the doctrine effect by responding to the appeals of any American State for friendly intervention in case of European encroachment. We have not interfered, and shall not interfere, with the existing possessions of any European power in this hemisphere, but those possessions must not, on any pretext, be extended.

We hopefully look forward to the eventual withdrawal of the European powers from this hemisphere, to the ultimate union of all of the English-speaking parts of the continent by the free consent of its inhabitants.

From the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American peoples to free themselves from European domination. We watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

The government of Spain, having lost control of Cuba, and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens, or to comply with its treaty obligations, we believe that the government of the United States should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island.

The peace and security of the republic and maintenance of its rightful influence among the nations of the earth, demand a naval power commensurate with its position and responsibility. We, therefore, favor the continued enlargement of the navy and a complete system of harbor and sea-coast defences.

We favor the creation of a national board of arbitration to settle and adjust differences which may arise between employers and employed engaged in interstate commerce.

As to the first section, "all our interests in the Western hemisphere" are not in the least conceivable danger at the present time, from any nation whatever, nor have they been for a long time. There was no occasion whatever to conjure up the ghost of dread in this respect, and to attempt to fortify people's confidence by an appeal to a "vigorous," foreign policy. It does not take a very fine sense to scent the Anglophobia which dictated this sentence, an appeal to which was thought necessary to catch votes.

Hawaii should *not* be controlled by the United States, nor by any other power, but should be allowed freely to control its own destinies, as every people has an inalienable right to do. There is quite as much to be said

against its annexation to the United States as in favor of it.

We have no objections to the United States building, owning and controlling the Nicaragua canal, *provided* the obligations taken upon us by the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty be faithfully observed until they be honorably abrogated, and *provided* the rights of other nations in such a great international water way be carefully secured. But our own interests in the prospective canal would be just as well secured if it were built by a combination of nations, or citizens of different nations, then neutralized and put under international control.

The platform is formally right in asserting that the "United States should exercise all the influence it can properly exert to bring these (Armenian) atrocities to an end." But what does it mean by "all the influence it can properly exert"? Does it mean anything more than has been done? Does it mean the sending of a fleet of war-ships? Does it mean a great moral influence, without threat of war, such as that which our country has often exercised in the interests of justice and liberty? Verily no man knoweth, except the straddler who never *knows* anything!

The reassertion of "the Monroe doctrine in its full extent," whatever that may mean, can have no other possible reference than to England, and is a covert and unworthy insinuation that she is encroaching upon Venezuela, an assertion which the framers of the platform did not dare openly to make, for it was to find out whether or not this is true that the Venezuela Commission was appointed, the distinguished members of which have already spent six months trying to find out the true state of the case and have not yet reported.

The declarations about Cuba are about as indefinite as the resolutions passed by Congress on the same subject. They commit nobody to anything except "sympathy," which is felt by all Americans regardless of party.

On the subject of the navy the platform is definite, and definitely wrong. The policy outlined in this plank is un-American and untrue to American history. It is as far as possible from being true that "the peace and security of the republic and the maintenance of its rightful influence among the nations of the earth demand a naval power commensurate with its position and responsibility." Such a naval power would mean a war fleet of 500 vessels, that is, larger than that possessed by Great Britain, the great naval power. Do sensible men in this country, of any party, really believe that we need such a fleet? The assertion made in the platform is an open and inexcusable abandonment of the principles and practices which have made our country strong, and safe and influential. If such a policy is ever carried out, it will mean the ultimate enthronement in free America of the tyranny of European militarism. After the war fleet and "a complete system of harbor and sea-coast defences," at a cost

of countless millions, will come an increasing clamor for an army "commensurate with our position and responsibility."

It is not to be wondered at that a platform containing such a plank as this about the navy and coast defences should have totally ignored the great subject of international arbitration now so conspicuously before the minds of the English-speaking people. Negotiations are actually in progress for the establishment by treaty of a permanent Anglo-American tribunal of arbitration. No greater subject, none fuller of promise for the future of civilization, none more in harmony with the genius of American institutions, was ever before our people, and yet this great convention, claiming to represent, and actually representing in many ways, the highest interests of the nation and the best progress of humanity, had not a word to say in its behalf! It had an opportunity to say something, for the subject was laid before the makers of the platform. What motive shall we assign for this regrettable silence?

The section of the platform referring to industrial arbitration in matters of interstate commerce is clear and admirable, and is, we do not hesitate to say, a clear indication of what the better element of the party would have said on the subject of international arbitration, if it had had the same conscientious courage on the subject that it had on the matter of the currency.

MR. PRATT'S VISIT.

The visit to this country of Mr. Hodgson Pratt, the distinguished chairman of the International Arbitration and Peace Association of London, has been greatly appreciated by the American friends of peace. After the Mohonk Conference, which he came on purpose to attend and at which his presence and speaking were greatly enjoyed, he spent several days at Washington, where he had a number of interviews with Secretary Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British Ambassador, and one with President Cleveland. He was received most cordially by the President and the Secretary of State, and the subject of arbitration was freely discussed during the interviews. The exact position of the negotiations for a treaty between this country and Great Britain were not made known to Mr. Pratt as they are not yet sufficiently advanced to be given out to the public.

After leaving Washington, Mr. Pratt made brief stops in Philadelphia and New York, to see some of the leading friends of the arbitration movement in these cities, speaking at each in behalf of the great cause to which he has given so many faithful and laborious years. He is greatly interested in the creation of an Anglo-American Committee which shall, in times of disturbance and misunderstanding, act as a medium of exact information to the public on the matters occasioning the excitement.